

Police Conduct Oversight Commission

Audit Committee Minutes

Regular Meeting August 2, 2016

Starting at 6:00 p.m.

350 Fifth Street, Room 241, Minneapolis, MN 55407

Committee Members Present: Andrea Brown, and Andrew Buss (Chair), and Jennifer Singleton.

Committee Members Absent: None.

Staff Present: Ryan Patrick - Police Conduct Operations Supervisor

Chair Buss called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

A quorum of the Committee was present.

Brown moved to adopt the meeting agenda.

Seconded.

No discussion. All-in-favor. None opposed.

The motion carried.

Ongoing Business

Risk Assessment Discussion

Ryan Patrick, Police Conduct Operations Supervisor, addressed the Committee. The following were the main points from his presentation:

- Discussed how to create a long-term plan for the Committee.
- Discussed creating and maintaining studies as the Committee moves along and analyze issues that are likely to cause a risk for the MPD.
- Discussed putting in place mechanisms to monitor to make sure issues are conducted above board.
- There are three categories of risk factors that include financial, relational, and criminal risk.

With the conclusion of the presentation from Mr. Patrick, the Chair opened the floor for discussion. The following is a list of speakers and a brief abstract of their individual comments:

Patrick - use-of-force is the biggest cost factor and financial risk that might come in the form of civil liabilities or lawsuits can create negative PR for the MPD.

Pending Approval

Brown - asked if risk assessment is based on their policy decisions, such as the current changes to 911 procedures, is something that would be added to the list or have its own category.

Buss - indicated that the 911 policy change would affect relations.

Patrick - the complaint filing process, which is an example for analysis, could make the argument that financially, due to lack of effective process leads to lawsuits. Once risk assessment is determined, then can translate into a document. Start the process by ranking the risks, e.g. is use-of-force higher ranking than the complaint process.

Buss - asked that with regard to financial risk, if it is beneficial to start by looking at what the City is paying out and what the items are for with the question of how to prevent those incidents from continuing to provide a better idea on what to track. Also questioned how to measure relational type issues stating that it is hard to quantify news stories.

Patrick - indicated that relations is a category where risk exists, but information could be provided by precinct, incident locations, and types of calls, among other topics. Now have access to software that can generate those statistics. To begin involves identifying what are top priorities and how the Committee will do quarter-by-quarter inquiries.

Singleton - indicated that perhaps the Committee members need more time to think about various categories and how to prioritize them asking if it would make sense to take time to think about it and bring ranked topics back to the next meeting for discussion.

Patrick - stated that he would also meet with everyone and help walk them through the process but ideally having financial, relations, and criminal ranks.

With no further discussion on the matter, the Chair moved to the next item on the agenda.

Complaint Filing Experience - Report Back

Ryan Patrick, Police Conduct Operations Supervisor, addressed the Committee. The following were the main points from his presentation:

- The report is pretty much finished.
- There were three goals, which included cataloging, reviewing sources, and improving filing source for OPCR.
- Questioned what mechanisms were in place and what improvements can be made to simplify the process.
- Complaint is a signed document, which eliminates telephone calls.
- 311 complaints lack signatures and do not qualify as complaints; also found issues with 311 misinformation and a lack of training on OPCR procedures.

Pending Approval

- Most common source for complaint filing was online, but it was not easy to find the form and no information was provided about the process and there was no acknowledgement provided to the complainant after the complaint was filed.
- The OPCR office is a challenge to find, the name is confusing, the building is intimidating, and lacks privacy for both OPCR and IA complaints.
- Filing at precinct locations, with the exception of the Fourth Precinct proved difficult and most attempts with testers were unsuccessful.
- Recommended that the MPD page be reformatted to include OPCR information, provide instructions, and address expectations for complainant after form is submitted, and provide training for officers and 311 operators.
- Also recommended creating off-site interview locations and filing sites.

With the conclusion of the presentation from Mr. Patrick, the Chair opened the floor for discussion. The following is a list of speakers and a brief abstract of their individual comments:

Brown - stated that it is policy for the complainant to ask for a sergeant when filing a complaint and every window officer had to get a sergeant to file a complaint.

Patrick - indicated that that policy is outdated. But this is a topic that can be audited occasionally and the forms should be tracked or counted.

Buss - suggested using a numbering system on complaint forms to assist with tracking. Also asked if the 311 operators have the ability to email form to the complainant for them to file online.

Patrick - indicated that it is pretty common to get an email response with most forms submitted online, it would be helpful if a similar system was used with the complaint forms.

Brown - asked if there will be more detail, such as demographic information and if there is a response time required at the OPCR.

Patrick - indicated that this is possible to include demographic data. The calculated time from initial filing and an intake investigator response on average is nine and a half days. Follow-up is easily within 14 days of filing the complaint.

With no further discussion on the matter, the Chair recognizes Commissioner Singleton and the following motion was made:

Move to recommend that the full Commission adopt this study and recommendations.

Seconded by Brown.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion. With no further discussion on the matter, the Chair called for a voice vote.

Pending Approval

All-in-favor. None opposed.

The motion carried.

Updates

Chair Buss indicated that there will be a meeting on Tuesday, September 6, 2016.

Public Comment

With no members of the public wanting to address the Committee, the Chair moved to the next item on the agenda.

Adjournment

With all of the Committee's business concluded, the Chair entertained a motion:

Brown moved to adjourn.

Seconded.

All-in-favor. None opposed.

The motion carried.

Chair Buss adjourned the meeting at 7:14 p.m.